United Nations A/C.2/60/SR.37

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
26 January 2006

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 37th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Thursday, 15 December 2005, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Koudelka (Vice-Chairman) ..... (Czech Republic)

Contents

Agenda item 50: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 52: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*)

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind (*continued*)

(g) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)

Agenda item 54: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(c) International migration and development (*continued*)

Agenda item 55: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*)

(b) Specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries: outcome of the International Ministerial Conference of Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International Financial and Development Institutions on Transit Transport Cooperation (*continued*)

Agenda item 59: Towards global partnerships (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

05-64547 (E)

In the absence of Mr. Wali (Nigeria), Chairman, Mr. Koudelka (Czech Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 4 p.m.

Agenda item 50: Macroeconomic policy questions (*continued*)

(b) International financial system and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.2 and A/C.2/60/L.67)

Draft resolutions on the international financial system and development

1. **The Chairman** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.67, which was being submitted by Mr. Hart (Barbados), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.2. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.67 was adopted.*

3. **Mr. Kariuki** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the European Union and those countries that had aligned themselves with the Union's position, said that outward investments from developing countries referred to in paragraph 5 were, in many cases, an indication of their integration into the world economy, and that those transfers frequently resulted from positive developments in their trade balances, thus allowing for debt repayments and the purchase of foreign assets. Those positive effects had been highlighted in previous resolutions and the European Union requested the Secretary-General to take them into account in future reporting, to be done in collaboration with the relevant institutional stakeholders.

4. With regard to paragraph 13 on risk-rating mechanisms, he stressed the importance of increasing transparency and competition in the private rating market, and of the need for capital markets to have widely accepted and comparable yardsticks in making investment decisions. The European Union had agreed to base the paragraph on paragraph 25 (d) of the World Summit Outcome, which should provide the framework for encouraging relevant developmental institutions to continue their work on that issue.

5. **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America) supported the views expressed by the United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Union, with regard to risk-rating mechanisms (para. 13).

6. His delegation also wished to support and elaborate upon the Union's position with regard to paragraph 5 on net outflow of financial resources. A net outflow could be either favourable or unfavourable for a particular country, depending on the circumstances. In one case, it could reflect a country's successful export-led growth strategy; in another, it could reflect capital flight due to conflict or weak governance that undermined the confidence of domestic residents and potential foreign investors. A negative net outflow might be the result of an increase in exports, payment of debt servicing, or the accumulation of foreign reserves. Those were actions taken by all countries, developed and developing alike, on the basis of what they felt was in their national interest. They were also actions that international investors looked for when making financial decisions.

7. His delegation was concerned that the emphasis on net outflows was misleading, distracted attention from the most important development issues and implicitly criticized some of the very pro-growth policies that the United States had been working so hard to promote.

8. **Ms. Mills** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, expressed satisfaction at the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus. The Group of 77 and China had listened with interest to the statements just made by the representative of the United Kingdom, on behalf of the European Union, and the representative of the United States of America. Paragraph 5 was of particular importance precisely because there could be a range of reasons for the net outflows experienced by developing countries over the past eight years, the effects of which could be very positive in certain specific cases, under very specific circumstances, but not in others. She hoped that further discussion of the issue would clarify its full implications.

9. **Mr. Hart** (Barbados), Vice-Chairman, expressed his and the Committee's good wishes to Ms. Grindlay (Australia), the facilitator of the draft resolution, who would be leaving the Second Committee, and thanked her for her hard work to achieve consensus not only on the draft resolution just adopted but also on every

major draft resolution and document adopted by the Second Committee in the past several years.

10. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.2 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 52: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of Agenda 21, the Programme for the Further Implementation of Agenda 21 and the outcomes of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (*continued*) (A/60/158)

11. **The Chairman** said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to take note of the report of the Secretary-General on actions taken in organizing the activities of the International Decade for Action, "Water for Life", 2005-2015 (A/60/158).

12. *It was so decided.*

(d) Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind

13. **Ms. Gordon** (Jamaica) introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, and drew attention to some minor editing changes in paragraph 2.

14. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution had no programme budget implications. A recorded vote had been requested on paragraph 7.

15. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation had called for a vote and was opposed to paragraph 7. The continued diversion of resources from the regular budget of the United Nations to subsidize independent and self-sustaining treaty bodies such as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change was disappointing. As a matter of principle, treaty bodies could and should collect the necessary funds from their membership to finance their activities. The United States supported the objectives of the Framework Convention and would continue to do so through voluntary contributions.

16. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that his delegation would vote against the paragraph. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change had its own budget and its own secretariat. As not all States Members of the United Nations were parties to the Convention and the Kyoto Protocol, the cost of conference-servicing should not be charged against the regular budget of the United Nations. The United Nations could continue to provide quality and cost-efficient conference-servicing to the Framework Convention but such services should no longer be provided free of charge.

17. *At the request of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab

Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Japan, Somalia, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel, Kazakhstan.

18. *Paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1 was adopted by 158 votes to 3, with 2 abstentions.**

19. **The Chairman** invited Committee members to take action on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev. 1 as a whole.

20. **Ms. Walpole** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of position on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union, while ready to join the consensus on the draft resolution as a whole, was disappointed that it did not reflect important decisions on climate change, agreed at the highest possible level at the start of the current session. She expressed satisfaction at the important outcomes of the eleventh session of the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention and the first session of the Conference of the Parties serving as the Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol, held recently in Montreal.

21. The European Union welcomed the adoption of the Marrakesh Accords, containing mechanisms and procedures for compliance that would allow effective implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, including flexible mechanisms. It also welcomed the decision to initiate a process to consider further commitments for Parties included in Annex I to the Convention for the period beyond 2012 in accordance with article 3, paragraph 9, of the Kyoto Protocol.

22. She expressed the European Union's satisfaction at the opening of a dialogue under the Framework Convention on long-term cooperative action to address climate change by enhancing implementation of the Convention and the adoption of the five-year programme of work on the scientific, technical and socio-economic aspects of impacts of, and vulnerability and adaptation to, climate change (FCCC/SBSTA/2004/L.31, para. 1).

23. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.23/Rev.1 as a whole, as orally revised, was adopted.*

24. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America) said that, while his delegation was committed to the objectives of the Framework Convention, since the adoption of the United Nations Millennium Declaration in September 2000, the United States had made it clear that it would neither ratify the Kyoto Protocol nor engage in efforts to ensure its entry into force or implementation. The United States therefore considered the reference in the tenth preambular paragraph to be historical in nature.

(g) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.35/Rev.1)

Draft resolution on the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

25. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.35/Rev.1, which was being submitted by the delegation of Jamaica on behalf of the Group of 77 and China. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications. He noted that a delegation had requested a recorded vote on paragraph 18 of the draft resolution.

26. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation had requested a recorded vote because it was disappointed by the continued diversion of resources from the regular budget to subsidize independent and self-sustaining treaty bodies, such as the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification. As a matter of principle, treaty bodies could and should collect the necessary funds from their membership to finance their activities. His delegation supported the objectives of the Convention and would continue to do so through voluntary contributions.

* The delegation of Somalia subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote in favour of paragraph 7 of the draft resolution.

27. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that his delegation would vote against paragraph 18 of the draft resolution. The Convention, which had been in place almost 10 years, was an independent body with its own budget and secretariat. Moreover, not all States were party to the Convention. The cost of servicing the conference of the Convention should therefore be separate from the regular budget and the Convention should reimburse the United Nations. The cost of conference-servicing would not change unless the General Assembly denied its services to the Convention and the task was outsourced.

28. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 18 of the draft resolution.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Japan, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel.

29. *Paragraph 18 was adopted by 159 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.35/Rev.1 was adopted.*

31. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that his delegation was committed to the objectives of the Convention but stressed, with regard to paragraph 12, that Governments contributed to the Convention strictly on a voluntary basis.

Agenda item 54: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(a) Globalization and interdependence (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.12 and A/C.2/60/L. 71)

Draft resolution on role of the United Nations in promoting development in the context of globalization and interdependence

32. **The Chairman** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.71, which he had submitted in his capacity as Vice-Chairman, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.12. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

33. **Ms. Mammadova** (Azerbaijan), speaking as facilitator, drew attention to two minor editorial changes in paragraphs 22 and 23, respectively, adding that paragraph 19 should be deleted.

34. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.71, as orally corrected, was adopted.*

35. **Ms. Shestack** (United States of America) said that, in joining the consensus on the draft resolution, the United States understood the term "right to development" to mean that each individual should enjoy the right to develop his or her intellectual and other capabilities to the maximum extent possible through the exercise of the full range of civil and political rights.

36. **Ms. Haycock** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union attached great importance to the social dimension of globalization and was committed to internal and external policies that contributed to maximizing the benefits and minimizing the costs of globalization for all countries. It welcomed efforts to promote corporate social responsibility and encouraged the private sector to contribute to corporate social responsibility initiatives that fostered fair globalization. The European Union underlined the importance of the relationship between business sector development and pro-poor growth and was undertaking a range of initiatives to enhance the role of the private sector in development.

37. **Ms. Brown** (Canada) said that her Government attached great importance to the protection and promotion of cultural diversity. The Convention on the protection and promotion of the diversity of cultural expressions, which had been adopted at the recent General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), recognized that cultural goods and services had both an economic and a social value, and also recognized the important link between culture and development. Canada had been the first to deposit its instrument of acceptance with UNESCO and encouraged all countries to ratify the Convention. Given the broad international support for the Convention, Canada regretted the failure to reach consensus on an explicit reference to the Convention in the draft resolution.

38. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.12 was withdrawn.*

(c) International migration and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.15/Rev.1, L.16, L.62, L.70)

Draft resolution on facilitation and reduction of the cost of transfer of migrants remittances

39. **The Chairman** drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.15/Rev.1 and informed the Committee that Italy, the Philippines and Turkey remained among the sponsors and had been joined by Argentina, Bolivia, Canada, Cape Verde, Colombia, Ecuador, El Salvador, Georgia, Guatemala, Mexico, Morocco, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Ukraine and Uruguay. The draft resolution contained no programme budget implications.

40. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.15/Rev.1 was adopted.*

41. **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America) said that his Government had joined the consensus on the draft resolution. The latter reflected the view of the international community that remittances were an important source of financing for development and recognized the need to promote cheaper and safer remittance transfers in both source and recipient countries. However, it did not actively encourage actions to ensure secure and transparent transfers to curb illegal activities such as terrorism financing nor did it actively encourage competition as a means to reduce costs and improve services. His Government encouraged countries to consider those important topics in formulating their remittance and financial services policies.

42. **Ms. Haycock** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union endorsed the draft resolution and would like to see a debate on how to increase the development impact of remittance transfers in recipient countries. As had been pointed out in General Assembly resolution 58/208, for many countries remittances by migrant workers were one of the major sources of foreign exchange.

43. The European Union agreed with the resolution text itself and was firmly convinced that future discussions on remittances should address measures and factors to reduce costs and strengthening of the existing national systems of remittance data collection. It looked forward to addressing those aspects at the upcoming High-Level Dialogue on International Migration and Development.

44. **Ms. Brown** (Canada) said that her Government aligned itself with the explanation of position given by the European Union.

45. **Mr. Mbayu** (Cameroon) said that his delegation had wished to join the sponsorship.

Draft resolutions on international migration and development

46. **The Chairman** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62 which he had submitted in his capacity as Vice-Chairman on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.16, adding that the programme budget implications were contained in document A/C.2/60/L.70. He read out a number of corrections to the draft resolution.

47. **Ms. Ryder** (Switzerland) said that her delegation would like to introduce ",within existing resources" at the end of paragraph 7.

48. **The Chairman** said that, if no objections were raised, he would take it that the Committee wished to accept paragraph 7, as orally amended.

49. *It was so decided.*

50. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that Belarus had joined the sponsors of the draft resolution.

51. **Mr. Seth** (Secretary of the Committee) replying to a question from **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America) said that the budgetary impact of the amendment to paragraph 7 would have to be analysed. If any changes were required by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ) and the Fifth Committee, they would be reflected in a revised statement of programme budget implications.

52. **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America) said that, under rule 153, his delegation requested a new programme of budgetary implications based on paragraph 7, as orally amended.

53. **The Chairman** said that action on the draft resolution would be postponed pending consideration of the programme budget implications by the Advisory Committee.

54. *It was so decided.*

Agenda item 55: Groups of countries in special situations (*continued*)

(a) Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.32/Rev.1, L.52 and L.69)

Draft resolution on the Third United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries: high-level meeting on the midterm comprehensive global review of the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010

55. **The Chairman** drew attention to the programme budget implications which were contained in document A/C.2/60/L.52.

56. **Mr. Cannell** (United Kingdom) proposed that paragraph 6 of the draft resolution should be replaced by the text contained in document A/C.2/60/L.69. It had been carefully formulated to take into account the concerns of other delegations and was the fifth compromise proposal submitted by the European Union.

57. **Ms. Gordon** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that she could not accept the proposed amendment or any further amendments to the text which had been the subject of extensive negotiations.

58. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, stated that his delegation would vote against the proposed amendment simply because it failed to address the budgetary implications of the paragraph.

59. *A recorded vote was taken on the proposed amendment to paragraph 6.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei

Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Armenia, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Norway.

60. *The amendment was rejected by 112 votes to 45, with 5 abstentions.*

61. **Ms. Rødsmoen** (Norway) said that her delegation had abstained not because it had difficulties with the content of the amendment but because Norway supported the original draft of paragraph 6 as submitted by the Group of 77 and China.

62. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America) asked for a vote on paragraph 6. Speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, he said that his delegation would vote against the paragraph. The least developed countries, more than any other group, were confronted by poverty and obstacles to achieving the Millennium Development Goals and therefore rightly received special attention as part of poverty eradication efforts in the United Nations system. The proposed review had a budgetary implication of nearly $800,000, not counting the travel and accommodation expenses of delegates, and surpassed the proposed budget by $254,000. Those expenses could have been reduced substantially with proper planning and judicious implementation of General Assembly resolution 57/270 B, particularly its provisions that emphasized making use of existing United Nations mechanisms.

63. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 6.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

United States of America.

Abstaining:

Albania, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea,

Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

64. *Paragraph 6 was adopted by 117 votes to 1, with 45 abstentions.*

65. **Mr. Cannell** (United Kingdom), speaking in explanation of vote, said that the European Union had abstained. The European Union remained fully committed to the review of the Programme of Action as part of a wider global environment agenda and to General Assembly resolution 57/270 B and looked forward to a midterm review that would identify areas where progress was possible. In the previous year's resolution the international community had committed itself to outlining the modalities of such a review. The international community should clearly identify the objectives of the review before the review was undertaken; paragraph 6 did not do so. The European Union was also concerned over the programme budget implications of paragraphs 5 and 6 and wished to ensure that the predicted costs were either essential or could not be absorbed within existing resources. It was disturbing that, within a programme founded on partnership, the European Union's partners could not consider its concerns.

66. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.32/Rev.1, was adopted.*

67. **Mr. Ceinos-Cox** (United States of America), explaining his country's position, said that during the negotiations his delegation had shown much flexibility regarding the timing, duration, dates and structure of the review mandate. However, the Group of 77 had acted in a high-handed and irresponsible manner and had created an unfortunate precedent by breaking the traditional consensus on the issue of least developed countries. The budgetary implications of the review came to nearly $800,000; those funds would not contribute to the eradication of poverty.

68. Moreover, a negotiated outcome of the proposed review would necessitate a wasteful and time consuming procedure and would distract from a serious assessment of the progress made under the Programme of Action. The latter would be considered the following year by the Economic and Social Council and by the General Assembly. As both of those bodies could be expected to produce negotiated texts on the least developed countries, there was little need for a third negotiated text on the same subject. The United States would be willing to participate in the negotiation of a short declaration recommitting Member States to the goals and objectives of the Programme of Action. Lastly, regarding paragraph 7, although the Bretton Woods institutions should play a role in the Programme of Action, they had their own governing bodies and it was inappropriate for the General Assembly to direct an unnamed entity of the United Nations system to coordinate their preparation for the review.

69. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that even though paragraphs 5 and 6 did not contain the phrase "within existing resources", his delegation had joined the consensus because partnership with the least developed countries was of great importance to Japan. It expected the Secretariat to implement the budget as effectively as possible.

70. **Mr. Zerangourou** (Benin), speaking on behalf of the Coordination Bureau of Least Developed Countries, chaired by his country, underscored the significance of all contributions to a better implementation of the Programme of Action.

71. **Ms. Mills** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution by consensus but regretted that a vote had been necessary on the implementation of the Programme of Action and resented having been described as high-handed in negotiations despite the flexibility that it had shown with regard to many amendments.

(b) Specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries: outcome of the International Ministerial Conference of Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International Financial and Development Institutions on Transit Transport Cooperation (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.33 and A/C.2/60/L.68)

Draft resolution on specific actions related to the particular needs and problems of landlocked developing countries: outcome of the International Ministerial Conference of Landlocked and Transit Developing Countries and Donor Countries and International Financial and Development Institutions on Transit Transport Cooperation

72. **The Chairman** drew attention to draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.68, submitted by Mr. Alshabibi (Yemen), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.33.

73. **Mr. Seth** (Secretary of the Committee), referring to paragraph 15, said that provision had been made in the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007 for implementing the terms of the draft resolution. Therefore, should the Committee adopt the draft resolution, no additional appropriation would be required.

74. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan), speaking as facilitator of the draft resolution, drew attention to a number of minor editorial changes.

75. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.68, as orally revised, was adopted.*

76. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.33 was withdrawn.*

Agenda item 59: Towards global partnerships (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.38/Rev.1)

Draft resolution towards global partnerships

77. **The Chairman** invited the Committee to consider draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.38/Rev.1, adding that it had no programme budget implications. The delegations of Albania, Belarus, Bolivia, Burundi, Canada, Cape Verde, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Japan, Madagascar, Mali, the Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Somalia, Switzerland, Ukraine and Uruguay had become sponsors of the draft resolution.

78. **Mr. Fonseca** (Brazil) drew attention to two minor editorial changes.

79. **Mr. Cremades** (Spain) said that three revisions should be made to the Spanish text of the draft resolution. In the last preambular paragraph and in paragraph 14, the phrase "non-public" in the English text should be rendered "*no públicos*" in the Spanish text rather than "*no gubernamentales*" and "*no estatales*", respectively. In paragraph 5, the word "*asociaciones*" should be replaced by the word "*organizaciones*".

80. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.38/Rev.1, as orally revised, was adopted.*

81. **Mr. Mally** (United States of America) said that his delegation had joined the consensus on the resolution because it strongly supported efforts by the United Nations to make greater use of partnerships, in particular public-private partnerships, in carrying out its activities. Enhancing cooperation between the United Nations and the private sector, civil society and non-governmental organizations would greatly increase the efficiency of the Organization s work. In that context, his delegation interpreted references to "partnerships" throughout the draft resolution as referring to partnerships between the United Nations and all relevant partners.

82. His Government, in an effort to support good corporate citizenship, made annual awards to firms that set positive examples in that regard. Corporate responsibility should, however, be placed in its proper context. A firm's principal responsibility was to those with whom it had a contractual or business relationship and its principal function was to produce and sell goods and services. In doing so, it provided public benefits in the form of healthy economies, jobs, income, goods, services, skills, capital or technology. Governments, meanwhile, should accept their responsibility to put in place an appropriate framework for economic activity and the protection of human rights. Political and social agendas that were the responsibility of governments must not be shifted to businesses under the guise of corporate responsibility initiatives.

83. **Mr. Blake** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that the Group of 77 and China had shown flexibility in the effort to reach consensus but regretted that no agreement had been reached on provisions concerning the important issue of corporate social responsibility.

The meeting rose at 6.10 p.m.

United Nations A/C.2/60/SR.38

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
30 January 2006

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 38th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Friday, 16 December 2005, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Koudelka (Vice-Chairman) ..... Czech Republic

Contents

Agenda item 52: Sustainable development (*continued*)

(g) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (*continued*)

Agenda item 54: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(c) International migration and development (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

05-64805 (E)

In the absence of Mr. Wali (Nigeria), Chairman, Mr. Koudelka (Czech Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.50 p.m.

Agenda item 52: Sustainable development *(continued)*

(g) Implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa *(continued)* (A/C.2/60/L.34, A/C.2/60/L.65 and A/C.2/60/L.74)

Draft resolution on the International Year of Deserts and Desertification, 2006

1. **Mr. Sermoneta** (Israel) introduced document A/C.2/60/L.65, containing his country's proposed amendment to the draft resolution before the Committee. Israel was a world leader in research on desertification and land degradation and its scientists gladly shared their expertise and had for many years been active in extending technical assistance to countries affected by those phenomena, especially in Africa.

2. For those reasons, his delegation had participated in the informal consultations on both draft resolutions under agenda item 52 (g) and had sought to include in draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 a paragraph welcoming the decision of the Government of Israel to host an international conference on desertification in connection with the observance of the International Year of Deserts and Desertification, 2006. It was common practice for the General Assembly to recognize initiatives taken by Member States on issues of global importance. Indeed, the draft resolution already included a paragraph relating to such an initiative by another Member State.

3. It had gradually become clear that, despite wide support for Israel's proposal, it would not be possible to incorporate it into the draft resolution and the negotiations had consequently been brought to a grinding halt. Because of that obvious discrimination — which was not only pernicious per se but also insulting in the light of the contributions Israel had made to fighting desertification — his delegation had been compelled to introduce the desired text as an amendment. He called on Committee members to vote in favour of the amendment in order to reaffirm the fundamental principle of equal treatment of all Member States.

4. **The Chairman** said that a recorded vote on the proposed amendment had been requested.

5. **Mr. Diaw** (Mauritania), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States in explanation of vote before the voting, said that the issue of combating desertification was indeed of the utmost importance; however, the delegation proposing the draft amendment was not as committed to fighting desertification as it claimed to be. Israel was seeking international endorsement and support for its planned conference on desertification even though it had refused to take responsibility for its own desertification-causing practices. Those unlawful and devastating practices had been well documented in various reports, including the report prepared by the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia on the economic and social repercussions of the Israeli occupation on the living conditions of the Palestinian people in the occupied Palestinian territory, including Jerusalem, and of the Arab population in the occupied Syrian Golan (A/60/65-E/2005/13, annex). The Committee itself had recently adopted a draft resolution condemning the illegal exploitation of Palestinian land, the detrimental effects of the unlawful construction of the wall, the uprooting of fruit-bearing trees and the razing of land in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan (A/C.2/60/L.11/Rev.1).

6. The Arab Group therefore found it difficult to accept the Israeli amendment and would vote against it. It invited all Member States to give serious consideration to the grave implications of adopting the paragraph.

7. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by Israel, contained in document A/C.2/60/L.65.*

In favour:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania,

Luxembourg, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay.

Against:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei Darussalam, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Nepal, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Dominican Republic, Egypt, El Salvador, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Mali, Nicaragua, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

8. *The amendment proposed by Israel, contained in document A/C.2/60/L.65, was adopted by 83 votes to 34, with 30 abstentions.*

9. **Ms. Walpole** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union had supported the inclusion of the paragraph because it believed that it was fair to include mention in the resolution of any government-sponsored international meeting that would focus on, and contribute to, the objectives of the International Year of Deserts and Desertification. The proposed Be'er Sheva conference fit those criteria.

10. **Mr. Mabhongo** (South Africa) said that his delegation continued to support the Middle East peace process and all efforts aimed at bringing lasting peace to that important part of the world. It had voted in favour of the amendment, in the belief that the conference would provide an opportunity for sharing information and hoped that it would address the root causes of desertification, especially in the Middle East, as well as in other parts of the world, and that all who wished to attend would be permitted to do so.

11. **Mr. Tharyat** (Indonesia) said that Indonesia had always attached great importance to the international community's efforts to remedy the problems caused by land degradation and desertification and was concerned about the donor community's rapidly flagging interest in providing financing for the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification.

12. It was disheartening that a recorded vote had had to be taken in connection with the draft resolution on the International Year of Deserts and Desertification. His delegation was in no way opposed to the convening of international conferences to deal with desertification issues; however, to have real meaning such conferences must have the participation of countries that were directly affected. If the conference were held in Israel a number of seriously affected countries might not be able to participate due to technical constraints or because of strong political principles. For that reason, his delegation had voted against the proposed amendment.

13. **Mr. Rimdap** (Nigeria) said that although Nigeria condemned any act by the Israelis in the occupied Arab territories, including the Palestinian territories his delegation had voted in favour of the proposed amendment in the belief that a conference on desertification was a technical issue of interest to every country.

14. **Mr. Diaw** (Mauritania), speaking on behalf of the Group of Arab States, proposed the insertion of a new paragraph — the text of which was contained in document A/C.2/60/L.74 — after the third preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 to provide essential balance to the text following the adoption of the amendment proposed by Israel. The language of the proposed amendment was virtually identical to that contained in a resolution the Committee had adopted two weeks earlier (A/C.2/60/L.11/Rev.1) whereby delegations had expressed their concern at the extensive destruction by Israel the occupying Power, of agricultural land and orchards in the Occupied

Palestinian Territory, including the uprooting of a vast number of fruit-bearing trees.

15. The proposed amendment was directly linked to the draft resolution before the Committee in both its substance and implications and addressed an issue that gravely aggravated desertification in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and the occupied Syrian Golan. The issue had been extensively detailed in numerous reports by the United Nations, most recently in the report of the Secretary-General containing the report of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs on vegetation loss in Beit Hanoun during the 2001-2004 period. The Palestinian people had suffered far too long under Israel's policies of bulldozing their agricultural fields, uprooting their fields and trees and converting their scarce green areas and fruit-bearing orchards into arid deserts. That had and would continue to spell food dependency and deprivation for the Palestinian people, rather than a future of hope and economic opportunity. The Arab Group therefore urged all delegations to support the inclusion of the paragraph.

16. **The Chairman** said that a recorded vote on the proposed amendment contained in document A/C.2/60/L.74 had been requested.

17. **Mr. Sermoneta** (Israel), making a general statement before the vote, expressed his delegation's surprise at the introduction of a text that, had not been brought up during the lengthy deliberations on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 and noted that the language of the proposed paragraph was a transplant from a resolution on an entirely different matter that would be more appropriately addressed in other forums. He therefore urged the initiators of the text to reconsider its introduction.

18. **Mr. Alsaker** (Norway), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that even though his delegation had voted in favour of the resolution on the permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people over their natural resources, it would vote against the proposed amendment for the latter was not sufficiently relevant to the topic under consideration and might even prove counterproductive in terms of making the International Year a platform for united efforts to deal effectively with desertification. The focus must be kept on the actual issue, namely, efforts to combat desertification.

19. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America) said that the United States would vote against the proposed amendment, which was inappropriate for what should be a technical resolution focused on efforts to tackle the challenges of desertification, and he urged other delegations to do likewise. He viewed it as a transparent attempt to politicize what should be an apolitical resolution and served as a reminder that some delegations placed a premium on political grandstanding over practical solutions aimed at addressing real challenges.

20. **Ms. Walpole** (United Kingdom), said that the United Kingdom would vote against the proposed amendment, which was inappropriate and unnecessary in relation to the agenda item. Her delegation was dismayed that the amendment had been introduced at the very last moment and had not been formally circulated until that day.

21. **Mr. Al-Ghanim** (Kuwait) said that the proposed amendment was very relevant to the draft resolution, as it dealt with a basic development issue, namely, agriculture, and the Palestinian people's right to development.

22. **Mr. Brousseau** (Canada) said that, in the specific context of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34, the proposed amendment was inappropriate and superfluous. His delegation was also concerned that the amendment had been put forward at the last minute and had not been formally circulated in sufficient time to be studied by Committee members. His delegation would vote against it.

23. **Ms. Kostensen** (Denmark) said that her delegation would vote against the proposed amendment. Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 was a technical resolution that should not be burdened with political and unbalanced text elements. The Arab Group's concerns should be dealt with under the agenda item on the Middle East peace process.

24. **Mr. Hamburger** (Netherlands) said that, although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution on the permanent sovereignty of the Palestinian people over their natural resources, it would vote against the proposed amendment, which was inappropriate and unnecessary in the context of the agenda item. As stated by the representative of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union in the explanation of vote on the draft resolution on permanent sovereignty, the issues referred to in the

proposed amendment were matters that needed to be dealt with in the framework of the permanent-status negotiations of the Middle East peace process. Lastly, his delegation was dismayed that the amendment had been put forward at the very last moment.

25. **Mr. Hijazi** (Observer for Palestine), making a general statement, lamented that the ready accusation of politicizing the issue was levelled against every proposal to incorporate a reference to the Occupied Palestinian Territory in a resolution. It was quite clear from the language of the proposed paragraph that it was to be construed in the context of desertification.

26. Moreover, since all Member States would be working hard to address the issue of desertification in a comprehensive manner in the International Year, it would be counterproductive to exclude the issue of desertification in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem. The proposed paragraph was directly linked to the draft resolution before the Committee in both its substance and implications. At issue were the policy-driven actions of Israel, the occupying Power, that directly and indirectly contributed to the aggravation of desertification in the Middle East. He appealed to all Committee members to give the proposed paragraph their support.

27. **Mr. Sermoneta** (Israel) said that his delegation was disappointed that such a politicized text was being forced forward by its initiators since throughout negotiations it had been politicization that had held back consensus. The late introduction of a totally unrelated text left no doubt that the sole purpose of its originators was to try and "neutralize" the positive reference to Israel just voted into the draft resolution. His delegation would vote against the proposed amendment and called on all those delegations that were concerned by the issue at hand, the rationalization of the work of the General Assembly and the detrimental effects of undue politicization of the work of the United Nations to do likewise.

28. *A recorded vote was taken on the amendment proposed by Mauritania on behalf of the Group of Arab States, contained in document A/C.2/60/L.74.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, China, Comoros, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Somalia, South Africa, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Suriname, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Malawi, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, San Marino, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of).

29. The amendment proposed by Mauritania on behalf of the Group of Arab States, contained in document A/C.2/60/L.74, was adopted by 48 votes to 29, with 74 abstentions.*

30. **Mr. Sinha** (India) said that his delegation had abstained from the vote simply because it was

* The delegation of Papua New Guinea subsequently informed the Committee that it had intended to vote against the amendment contained in A/C.2/60/L.74.

disappointed that political elements had been inserted into the draft resolution.

31. **Ms. Bauzán de Senes** (Uruguay) said that her delegation had abstained even though it had voted earlier in favour of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.11/Rev.1, because the paragraph in question had been taken out of context and had nothing to do with the International Year of Deserts and Desertification.

32. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 as a whole.

33. **Ms. Quintavalle** (Italy) said that her delegation wished to propose further amendments; these had been agreed to by all delegations during informal meetings. The fourth preambular paragraph should now read "Conscious of the need to raise public awareness and to protect the biological diversity of deserts as well as indigenous and local communities and the traditional knowledge of those affected by this phenomenon."; in the fifth preambular paragraph, the words "to host a world summit" should be replaced by "to convene and host an international conference with the participation of Heads of State and Government"; in paragraph 3, the words "Also reiterates its call to" should be replaced by "Encourages"; in paragraph 4, the words "Calls upon" should be replaced by "Invites"; and in paragraph 7, the words "Invites the Global Environment Facility" should be replaced by "Notes with interest the decision of the Global Environment Facility Council".

34. **Ms. Gordon** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, asked for the meeting to be suspended so that they could look at the proposed amendments.

The meeting was suspended at 4.40 p.m. and resumed at 5.15 p.m.

35. **The Chairman** said that he took it that the Committee wished to adopt the amendments to draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 proposed by Italy.

36. *It was so decided.*

37. **The Chairman** informed the Committee that a recorded vote had been requested on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34 as a whole, as amended.

38. **Mr. Al-Ghanim** (Kuwait), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that, despite the amendments, his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution as a whole because the latter addressed an important development issue.

39. **Ms. Quintavalle** (Italy), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that her delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution, as amended, in order to reaffirm its role as the main sponsor of the International Year of Deserts and Desertification. It deeply regretted that it had not been possible to adopt the resolution by consensus. Her delegation hoped that the unnecessary confrontations and divisions that had characterized approval of the draft resolution would not affect the Year's success.

40. **Mr. Sermoneta** (Israel), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, said that his delegation would be constrained to abstain from the vote on the draft resolution as a whole because of the amendment that had been introduced and adopted at that meeting. His delegation had approached negotiations in a constructive and professional fashion with a view to contributing to the international community's efforts regarding desertification. Israel was grateful to those delegations that had supported the inclusion of a paragraph welcoming its initiative to host an international conference on desertification.

41. Unfortunately, some delegations — including from countries likely to send representatives to the said conference — believed that Israel should be discriminated against and had made every effort to keep any positive reference to Israel out of the draft resolution. Having failed in those efforts, they had introduced language from an unrelated resolution and that language had been adopted. In doing so, they had not only provided conclusive proof of their real motives, but had also caused considerable damage, throwing what was supposed to be a straightforward consensus resolution into disarray, making a mockery of desertification and trampling on the concerns of an entire continent. If in a year of revival and reform it was still possible for a few delegations to hold the Committee hostage to anachronistic whims on a simple resolution, something was definitely wrong.

42. Notwithstanding, Israel acknowledged the overall importance that the international community attached to combating desertification, supported efforts in that regard and reiterated its strong commitment to the spirit of the resolution and the many constructive aspects thereof.

43. **Mr. Sabbagh** (Syrian Arab Republic), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote against the draft resolution because of the amendment introduced by Israel. While claiming to be in the forefront of efforts to combat desertification, Israel was actually contributing to desertification in the occupied Arab lands. Its uprooting of trees in the occupied territories and burial of nuclear waste in the occupied Syrian Golan had been documented in the report prepared by the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia and in that of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories (contained, respectively, in documents A/60/65-E/2005/13 and A/60/380). In a resolution adopted earlier that year, the Committee had called upon Israel to cease endangering natural resources and dumping various kinds of waste in the occupied territories.

44. His delegation had supported the original text of the draft resolution, and it had welcomed all subsequent amendments thereto, except for the one introduced by the representatives of the Israeli occupation authorities.

45. **Mr. Al-Rasheed** (Saudi Arabia), speaking in explanation of the vote before the vote, said that, although his delegation supported the draft resolution, it would have to abstain because, for legal reasons it could not support certain paragraphs.

46. **Mr. Al-Athra** (Qatar), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that his delegation would vote in favour of the draft resolution because it supported development and combating desertification. It welcomed Algeria's offer to host the conference.

47. *A recorded vote was taken on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34, as amended.*

In favour:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, France, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, India, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Syrian Arab Republic.

Abstaining:

Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

48. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.34, as amended, was adopted by 111 votes to 1, with 42 abstentions.*

49. **Mr. Abdelbary** (Sudan) said that despite his delegation's support for all the issues addressed, it had abstained in the vote because of the inclusion of the paragraph proposed by Israel, which was unacceptable and ran counter to the resolution.

50. **Mr. Gomez Robledo** (Mexico) said that his delegation had voted against the amendment proposed by the Group of Arab States because it was irrelevant to the resolution, but had voted in favour of the draft resolution as a whole. It regretted the politicization and lack of transparency shown.

51. **Mr. Elmejerbi** (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that the draft resolution just adopted contained positive elements which his delegation supported, including the initiative by Algeria to host the conference. However, it had abstained in the vote because it could not be party to a propaganda campaign by the Israeli occupying authority, which had destroyed acres of agricultural land and fruit trees.

52. **Mr. Salazar** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that his delegation attached great importance to the topic and had voted in favour of the draft resolution. He stressed that the original intention of the Group of 77 and China in introducing the resolution should be recalled.

53. **Mr. Brousseau** (Canada) said that his Government recognized the importance of combating desertification and had already begun preparations for activities in observance of the International Year of Deserts and Desertification. However, because of its concern at the politicization of the process, his delegation had abstained.

54. **Mr. Khan** (Pakistan) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution because it believed that the issues addressed deserved the support of the international community, but it regretted the lack of consensus.

55. **Ms. Tchitanava** (Georgia) said that, had her delegation been present during the vote, it would have abstained.

56. **Mr. Khammanichanh** (Lao People's Democratic Republic) said that his delegation had not intended to participate in the vote and requested that the record be corrected.

Agenda item 54: Globalization and interdependence (*continued*)

(c) International migration and development (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.16, A/C.2/60/L.62 and A/C.2/60/L.70)

Draft resolution on international migration and development

57. **The Chairman** recalled that paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62 had been orally amended by the addition of the words "within existing resources" to the end of the paragraph.

58. **Mr. Seth** (Committee Secretary) drew attention to the statement of programme budget implications contained in A/C.2/60/L.70, noting that, as described in paragraph 3, the costs of the four round tables associated with the High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development were estimated at $55,200. As mentioned in paragraph 8, it had been determined after review that the additional meeting and conference servicing requirements were beyond the absorptive capacity of the provisions to be made under section 2 of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. The amendment to paragraph 7 of the draft resolution did not alter the fact that more resources would be needed.

59. **The Chairman** said that Belarus had joined the sponsors. A recorded vote had been requested on paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62.

60. **Mr. Kotis** (United States of America) said that while his delegation was in general supportive of the draft resolution and of the High-level Dialogue on International Migration and Development, it had requested a recorded vote on paragraph 7 because the costs involved were beyond the absorptive capacity of the programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007. Therefore, his delegation would vote against the inclusion of the paragraph.

61. **Mr. Sunaga** (Japan) said that his delegation would vote against the inclusion of the paragraph, and reserved the right to comment further during the debate in the Fifth Committee on the second performance report. It was disappointed that it had not been possible to avoid programme budget implications, and urged that every effort should be made to find redundancies.

62. *A recorded vote was taken on paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic,

Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Japan, United States of America.

Abstaining:

Israel.

63. *Paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62 was adopted by 159 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.*

64. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.62 was adopted as orally amended and corrected.*

65. **Ms. Haycock** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union had been pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution but was concerned that the Committee had been informed of its programme budget implications at such a late stage in its consideration. It would take up those concerns when the relevant section of the proposed programme budget was considered in the Fifth Committee.

66. **Ms. Brown** (Canada) said that her delegation aligned itself with the statement of the United Kingdom on behalf of the European Union.

The meeting was suspended at 6 p.m. and rose at 6.50 p.m.

United Nations A/C.2/60/SR.39

General Assembly
Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
26 January 2006

Original: English

Second Committee

Summary record of the 39th meeting
Held at Headquarters, New York, on Monday, 19 December 2005, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Koudelka (Vice-Chairman) ..... (Czech Republic)

Contents

Agenda item 51: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development (*continued*)

Agenda item 56: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) (*continued*)

(b) Women in development (*continued*)

Agenda item 116: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*)

Completion of the main part of the Committee's work

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

05-65061 (E)

In the absence of Mr. Wali (Nigeria), Mr. Koudelka (Czech Republic), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 4.20 p.m.

Agenda item 51: Follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.6 and L.72)

Draft resolutions on follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development

1. **The Chairman** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.72, which was being submitted by Mr. Hart (Barbados), Vice-Chairman of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.6. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

2. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.72 was adopted.*

3. **Mr. Mally** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, said that the United States, while a strong supporter of the Monterrey Consensus, believed that the resolution did not take a final decision on the exact timing or venue of the proposed follow-up conference. General Assembly resolution 57/270 B, particularly paragraphs 27 and 73, strongly emphasized the appropriate use of existing institutions and mechanisms. The United States looked forward to further discussion of that issue during the sixty-first session of the General Assembly.

4. **Mr. Brousseau** (Canada), speaking on behalf of Australia, New Zealand and Canada (CANZ), said that while the CANZ Group had not wished to block consensus on the important resolution just adopted, it was disappointed and perplexed by the absence of any reference to remittances. The Monterrey Consensus was not limited to public funds for public purposes; rather, it addressed all financing sources that could help countries to eradicate poverty, achieve sustained economic growth and promote sustainable development as a step towards a fully inclusive and equitable global economic system.

5. Remittances were specifically mentioned in the Monterrey Consensus, and with good reason. In 2005, the flow of remittances to developing countries was estimated by some sources at over US$ 165 billion. Factoring in informal, unrecorded flows could bring that figure to nearly $250 billion.

6. The CANZ Group strongly supported the resolution on the facilitation and reduction of the cost of transfer of migrant remittances (A/C.2/60/L.15/Rev.1), particularly its second preambular paragraph recognizing that remittance flows constituted sources of private capital, complemented domestic savings and were instrumental in improving the well-being of recipients. It regretted that an opportunity had been missed in the draft resolution on financing for development to call on Member States to "adopt policies and undertake measures to reduce the cost of transfer of migrant remittances to developing countries and to pursue measures destined to facilitate access to banks and financial institutions".

7. The CANZ Group did not call for remittances to be "directed" or "channelled" and was outspoken in rejecting false equations with official development assistance. It believed, however, that it was a matter of consistency, common sense and good policy to recognize and treat remittances as a financial flow and as one that could help to "eradicate poverty, achieve sustained economic growth and promote sustainable development". The CANZ Group would continue to act on the basis of those views.

8. **Mr. Kariuki** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union attached great importance to the successful implementation of the Monterrey Consensus and was pleased to have played its part in building on it. He expressed satisfaction that agreement had been reached on some of the modalities for the review conference, including the issues it would address, consistent with the provisions of resolution 57/270 B, and that the timing of the follow-up conference had been narrowed down; the European Union's preference for holding the conference in 2009 was well known.

9. The European Union looked forward to discussions of the matter during the sixty-first session of the General Assembly and to further developing the modalities and preparations for the conference. It welcomed the generous offer of Qatar in that connection but also believed that, as set out in resolution 57/270 B, follow-up and review conferences should take place as far as possible within existing United Nations institutions.

10. Regrettably, a large number of amendments to the resolution had been introduced very late, including on such issues as ODA timetables, on which significant progress had been achieved during the session. It was to be hoped that such late amendments could be avoided in future.

11. **Mr. Ruiz Massieu Aguirre** (Mexico) welcomed the adoption of the draft resolution, which reflected the dynamic pace at which financing for development issues were advancing in the United Nations. His delegation was pleased that the Committee had been able to act on the provisions of paragraph 73 of the Monterrey Consensus by deciding to hold a follow-up conference in 2008 or 2009 and hoped that the modalities for that conference could be developed further during the sixty-first session of the Assembly. He thanked Qatar for offering to host the conference.

12. **Ms. Mills** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, said that, although the final text of the draft resolution did not fully reflect its views, the Group of 77 and China had been pleased to join the consensus in a spirit of flexibility and compromise, thereby preserving the partnership established in Monterrey. The Group of 77 and China welcomed, in particular, progress in deciding modalities for the follow-up conference. While continuing to support the holding of the conference in Qatar, the Group of 77 and China looked forward to future discussion of the issue at the sixty-first session of the Assembly.

13. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.6 was withdrawn.*

The meeting was suspended at 4.35 p.m. and resumed at 5 p.m.

Agenda item 56: Eradication of poverty and other development issues (*continued*)

(a) Implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006) (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.41 and L.73)

Draft resolutions on the implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty (1997-2006)

14. **The Chairman** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.73, which was being submitted by Mr. Alshabibi (Yemen), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.41. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

15. **Mr. Hart** (Barbados) said that, following the adoption of the resolution on the follow-up to and implementation of the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development, a number of changes had been made to the text of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.73. Paragraphs 16, 17 and 18 would be replaced by paragraphs 5, 5 (a), 5 (b), 5 (c), 5 (e) and 5 (f) of the draft resolution on financing for development the Committee had just adopted (A/C.2/60/L.72).

16. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.73, as orally revised, was adopted.*

17. **Mr. Mally** (United States of America) said that, in joining the consensus on the draft resolution, the United States understood the term "right to development" to mean that each individual should enjoy the right to develop his or her intellectual or other capabilities to the maximum extent possible through the exercise of the full range of civil and political rights.

18. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.41 was withdrawn.*

(b) Women in development (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.43 and L.64)

Draft resolutions on women in development

19. **The Chairman** introduced draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.64, which was being submitted by Mr. Alshabibi (Yemen), Rapporteur of the Committee, on the basis of informal consultations held on draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.43. The draft resolution had no programme budget implications.

20. **Mr. Blake** (Jamaica), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, requested a suspension of the meeting.

The meeting was suspended at 5.05 p.m. and resumed at 5.20 p.m.

21. **Mr. Ruiz Massieu Aguirre** (Mexico), speaking in his capacity as facilitator, said that the eleventh preambular paragraph should end after "between women and men and to development" in the third line. The end of paragraph 10 should read: "elaborate and implement, at all appropriate levels, plans of action to

eliminate violence against women and girls". Paragraph 28 should be deleted in its entirety.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.64, as orally revised, was adopted.*

23. **Ms. Shestack** (United States of America), speaking in explanation of position, referred to the second preambular paragraph of the draft resolution reaffirming the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the Beijing review conferences, and to the fourth preambular paragraph and paragraph 24, both of which contained the term "reproductive health", and reiterated her delegation's firm commitment to the empowerment of women and the promotion of women's fullest enjoyment of universal human rights and fundamental freedoms.

24. The United States had devoted substantial monetary and human resources towards programmes and activities to eliminate violence against women, including trafficking in women and children; increase access to health care, education and economic opportunities; empower women in conflict situations; protect and assist refugee women and internally displaced persons; increase women's political participation; and ensure de jure and de facto equality and non-discrimination.

25. The United States endorsed and reaffirmed the important political goals set out in the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action on the understanding that those documents constituted an important policy framework without creating international legal rights or legally binding obligations on States under international law and that, in accordance with the international consensus reached at the 2005 session of the Commission on the Status of Women and confirmed by the Chairperson of the Commission, the Beijing documents created no new international rights, including a right to abortion.

26. Her delegation's reaffirmation of the goals, objectives and commitments set out in those documents did not constitute a change in its position with respect to treaties it had not ratified. While the United States fully supported the principle of voluntary choice regarding maternal and child health and family planning, it had stated clearly and on many occasions, consistent with the Programme of Action adopted at the International Conference on Population and Development, that it did not recognize abortion as a method of family planning, nor did it support abortion in its reproductive health assistance.

27. As her delegation understood it, there was an international consensus that the terms "reproductive health services", "reproductive right" and "reproductive health" did not include abortion or constitute support, endorsement or promotion of abortion or the use of abortifacients. The United States supported the treatment of women who suffered injuries or illnesses caused by legal or illegal abortion, including, for example, post-abortion care, and did not categorize such treatment as an abortion-related service.

28. With regard to the ninth preambular paragraph recognizing the importance of respect for all human rights, including the right to development, the United States understood the term "right to development" to mean that each individual should enjoy the right to develop his or her intellectual or other capabilities to the maximum extent possible through the exercise of the full range of civil and political rights.

29. Referring to paragraph 14, she said that the United States accepted "equal pay for equal work" but had concerns about "work of equal value", as there were no internationally agreed criteria to decide whether a particular form of work was "of equal value" to another.

30. *Draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.43 was withdrawn.*

31. **Mr. Suárez Salvia** (Argentina) noted that the draft resolutions considered by the Committee during the current meeting had not been distributed in all the official languages of the Organization. That should not be regarded as a precedent for future meetings.

Agenda item 116: Revitalization of the work of the General Assembly (*continued*) (A/C.2/60/L.66)

Draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-first session of the General Assembly submitted by the Chairman

32. **The Chairman** drew attention to the Committee's draft programme of work for the sixty-first session of the General Assembly (A/C.2/60/L.66). The plenary Assembly, at its 17th meeting, had decided to allocate item 116 on revitalization of the work of the General Assembly to all the Main Committees for the

sole purpose of considering and taking action on their respective tentative programmes of work.

33. **Mr. Seth** (Secretary of the Committee) said that, in the light of the adoption of draft resolution A/C.2/60/L.64 on women in development, the final paragraph, of which stated that the Assembly decided to include in the provisional agenda of its sixty-second session the sub-item entitled "Women in development", item 9 (b) should be deleted from the draft programme of work for the sixty-first session. The item would be included in the draft programme of work for the sixty-second session, to be adopted at the end of the sixty-first session.

34. *The draft programme of work of the Second Committee for the sixty-first session of the General Assembly submitted by the Chairman, as orally revised, was adopted.*

Completion of the main part of the Committee's work

35. **The Chairman** drew Committee members' attention to two procedural issues. One had to do with side events, such as lectures and panel discussions, which he believed should not coincide with informal negotiations in order to ensure that all interested Committee members would have an opportunity to attend them. Special events should be scheduled during the formal meeting dealing with the relevant item. The other had to do with finding a way to expedite the work of the Committee while still allowing the necessary time for thorough deliberations and the achievement of consensus. The Bureau would be meeting with the Secretariat to discuss those and other issues with a view to submitting lessons learned and recommendations to next year's Bureau.

36. **Ms. Haycock** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union, welcomed the impetus to development provided by the 2005 World Summit, reaffirmed the Union's commitment to implementing the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and said that the Committee's work should be informed by the acknowledgement, at the Summit, that peace, security, development and human rights were interlinked and should be mutually reinforcing.

37. The European Union believed that consensus in the Committee was valuable and demonstrated a strong resolve to achieve the Millennium Development Goals. It would continue to work for consensus at future sessions.

38. **Mr. Kariuki** (United Kingdom), also speaking on behalf of the European Union, reaffirmed the Union's support for the process to revitalize the Committee and improve its working methods. Fewer and more focused reports and resolutions would enrich the quality and impact of the Committee's work. The European Union looked forward to continuing its work with the President of the General Assembly and the ad hoc working group established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 59/313, with a view to strengthening and revitalizing the General Assembly.

39. **Mr. Lolo** (Nigeria), speaking on behalf of Mr. Wali, the Chairman of the Committee, who, for health reasons, had been unable to attend the final meetings of the session, thanked Committee members for their support and added that expediting the work of the Committee was an issue that Mr. Wali, too, would have wished to address.

40. After the customary exchange of courtesies, in which **Ms. Haycock** and **Mr. Kariuki** (United Kingdom) on behalf of the European Union, **Ms. Mills** (Jamaica) on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, **Mr. Atiyanto** (Indonesia) on behalf of the Group of Asian States, and **Mr. Lolo** (Nigeria) participated, **the Chairman** declared that the Committee had completed the main part of its work for the sixtieth session.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.